

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 08/746,901	Applicant Elliot
	Examiner Steven Nguyen	Group Art Unit 2731

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jessica Young And Carl Evens

(3) _____

(2) See Attachment For Member Of PTO

(4) _____

Date of Interview Mar 3, 1999

Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement was reached. was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:

see attachment sheet

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

see attachment sheet

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

A personal interview was conducted on March 16, 1999. Representing applicants were attorney Jessica Young and General Patent Counsel Carl Evens from MCI. From the PTO were Group Director Jin Ng, Acting Group Director James Dwyer, SPEs Douglas Olms, Chi Pham and Jason Chan, and examiners Alpus Hsu, Melvin Marcelo, Huy Vu, Ricky Ngo, Melissa Carman, Kenneth Vanderpuye and Steven Nguyen.

Ms. Young gave an overview of the overall system as depicted in Figs. 19F and 1G in one of the applications. There were general discussions on the number of cases filed by MCI (126) and the grouping of these cases that are assigned to different examiners. Ms. Young and Mr. Evens indicated that due to the similarity of some of the pending applications, they would consider merging some applications and abandoning others. It was agreed that any preliminary amendments filed on these cases be submitted by the attorney by April 1, 1999 so the examiners will have an opportunity to review them before issuing the next Office Action.

Examiner Carman mentioned that some of the references listed on the Information Disclosure Statements were cited by her. Mr. Evens indicated that MCI wanted to bring to the attention of the PTO all references cited during prosecution of any of their cases. No specific reference was discussed during this interview.